the modest sum of $576,600 recommended by the Secretary-General would be approved.

63. Mr. TARZI (Saudi Arabia) said that his delegation wished to know whether the special mission would require resources immediately or in February 1995, considering that it was scheduled to depart at the end of December.

64. Mr. TAKASU (Controller) said that, in 1994, the special mission to Afghanistan had required additional resources of $530,000, which had been transferred from the programme for the elimination of apartheid. To the extent possible, an estimated $600,000 required in 1995 would be financed from the existing resources of the Department of Political Affairs. Referring to table 1 in document A/C.5/49/44, he noted that the remaining balance was $4.2 million, of which $1.8 million was available for non-post expenses. If a decision was further delayed, that sum of $1.8 million would have to cover, inter alia, activities relating to desertification, the critical economic situation in Africa and substantive servicing of the Sanctions Committees. Clearly, it would not be sufficient but the Secretariat would make the best use of the limited resources available to it.

65. Mr. OULD EL GHAOUTH (Mauritania) stressed the need for the equal treatment of items and for consistency in the decision-making process. The Committee should either take action on his proposal to approve the amount requested by the Secretary-General or refer it to informal consultations. The question of desertification was important to both his delegation and the Group of African States.

66. Mr. ALOM (Bangladesh) agreed with the Mauritanian representative. The Advisory Committee's recommendation was not consistent with paragraph 81 of the Secretary-General's report (A/C.5/49/44). Perhaps the problem should be discussed further in informal consultations. Desertification was a very important issue and should be treated accordingly.

67. Mr. DJACTA (Algeria) and Mr. AMARI (Tunisia) stressed the importance of the question of desertification to the African continent and said that the proposal by the Secretary-General was preferable to the recommendation of the Advisory Committee. If the Fifth Committee was not prepared to take a decision, the question should be referred to informal consultations.

68. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the question should be referred to informal consultations for further consideration.

69. It was so decided.

Revised estimates under sections 3 and 8 (Africa: critical economic situation, recovery and development) (A/48/7/Add.8; A/C.5/49/74 and Add.1; A/C.5/49/L.23)

70. Mrs. EMERSON (Portugal), Vice-Chairman, introduced draft resolution A/C.5/49/L.23, on which a consensus had been achieved in informal consultations. She hoped that it would be adopted without a vote.

71. Ms. SHENWICK (United States of America) said that her delegation had confirmed that afternoon that it could not join the consensus because of certain problems it had with paragraph 1. As it stood, the draft resolution did not indicate the benefits of the programme in operational terms. It did not take into account the proposal by the Secretary-General to strengthen activities in Africa under the Department of Political Affairs should the General Assembly decide to redeploy resources from the programme for the elimination of apartheid. It would be wiser to defer action until February 1995 when the two issues could be dealt with simultaneously as part of a more comprehensive approach.

72. The CHAIRMAN proposed referring the question to informal consultations for further consideration.

73. Mr. MAZEMO (Zimbabwe) expressed great surprise that, suddenly, the draft resolution was no longer a consensus text, even though it had been presumed to be so for some time. His delegation insisted that the Committee should make every effort to take action on the basis of the text before it.

74. Mrs. EMERSON (Portugal) said that problems of communication sometimes arose in large delegations. She expressed regret over any possible misunderstanding and suggested that the matter could be resolved immediately in informal consultations.

75. Mr. DJACTA (Algeria) said that his delegation, too, had been under the impression that the draft resolution satisfied the concerns of all. He wished to remind the Committee that the new budget section for Africa had already been discussed at the previous session of the General Assembly when the programme budget for the biennium 1994-1995 had been adopted. At that time, the Group of African States had made many concessions; it had also agreed to submit the current proposal to the Committee for Programme and Coordination and to the Advisory Committee. His delegation therefore wondered what was impeding a consensus and appealed to the Chairman to seek a solution.

76. Mr. MONGELLA (United Republic of Tanzania) said that his delegation was also surprised and was reluctant to engage in further negotiations which might undermine the consensus. His delegation, too, appealed to the Chairman to preserve the consensus on the draft resolution in its current form.

77. Mr. OULD EL GHAOUTH (Mauritania) agreed wholeheartedly with the comments made by the representatives of other African countries. His delegation, too, appealed to the Chairman to preserve the delicate consensus which had been achieved, particularly since the Committee was behind schedule and was delaying the work of the plenary Assembly. Reopening negotiations on an agreed text would set a dangerous precedent. His delegation insisted that the consensus should be respected.

78. Mr. STITT (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had also been taken aback by the turn of events and agreed with the comments which had been made in that regard. As the representatives of the African countries knew, his delegation had difficulty with the concept contained in paragraph 3 and did not favour incorporating the formula contained in the previous decision. It was not

sound budgetary practice to submit financial requirements in that manner. Should negotiations on the text be reopened, his delegation would be constrained to reiterate its earlier reservations. However, it was prepared to accept the text in its current form without further amendment.

79. Ms. SHENWICK (United States of America) said that the fact that the United States delegation to the Fifth Committee was numerous did not mean that it was uncoordinated. That afternoon, the United States delegation had merely reconfirmed a position it had made very clear much earlier. Although it currently had problems with paragraph 1 and the concept it embodied, her delegation was completely willing to participate in informal consultations and believed that the end result would be an improved draft resolution.

80. Mrs. EMERSON (Portugal) said that she had been told by a member of the United States delegation that another member had difficulty with paragraph 1 but had received no further information, apparently because commitments to a subsidiary organ of the Fifth Committee had prevented that representative from communicating with her. She had therefore had no choice but to proceed on the basis of the information she had. She was, however, prepared to discuss the matter in informal consultations.

81. The CHAIRMAN proposed referring the question to informal consultations for further consideration.

82. It was so decided.

83. Mr. AMARI (Tunisia) said that the Committee had taken a very dangerous step which his delegation hoped would not be repeated. However, it agreed that further consideration in informal consultations was the proper course of action.

84. Mr. MONGELLA (United Republic of Tanzania) expressed his delegation's disappointment that negotiations would be reopened on a delicately balanced text which reflected all points of view. He failed to see how further consideration would lead to an improvement.

85. Mr. GOKHALE (India) agreed with all those delegations which had expressed support for the Chairman's text.

86. Mrs. GOICOCHEA (Cuba) said that, like other delegations, her delegation would not oppose the holding of informal consultations on the understanding that all delegations were now entitled to propose the same course of action in the future.

Mission for the Verification of Human Rights and of Compliance with the Commitments of the Comprehensive Agreement on Human Rights in Guatemala (continued) (A/49/7/Add.2; A/C.5/49/29)

87. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Fifth Committee should adopt the following draft resolution:

"The General Assembly,

"Having considered the report of the Secretary-General (A/C.5/49/29) and the related report of the Advisory Committee (A/49/7/Add.2),

"Approves an appropriation of $10,069,600 under section 4 of the programme budget for the biennium 1994-1995 for the Mission for the Verification of Human Rights and of Compliance with the Commitments of the Comprehensive Agreement on Human Rights in Guatemala (MINUGUA),

"Approves an appropriation of $728,100 under section 28, Staff assessment, offset by the same amount under income section 1, Income from staff assessment."

88. The draft resolution was adopted.

Agreement relating to the implementation of Part XI of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982 (continued) (A/49/7/Add.3; A/C.5/49/25)

89. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Fifth Committee should adopt the following draft resolution:

"The General Assembly,

"Having considered the report of the Secretary-General (A/C.5/49/25) and the report of the Advisory Committee (A/49/7/Add.3),

"Concurs in the observations of the Advisory Committee as contained in paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of its report,

"Approves an additional appropriation of $776,000 under section 32 of the programme budget for the biennium 1994-1995, offset by a reduction in the same amount under section 7,

"Decides that should additional resource requirements arise, the General Assembly would consider whether to authorize the Secretary-General to enter into related commitments, as appropriate."

90. The draft resolution was adopted.

AGENDA ITEM 122: FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS PROTECTION FORCE (continued) (A/C.5/49/L.9)

91. Mr. KELLY (Ireland) introduced the draft resolution submitted by the Chairman following informal consultations and drew attention, in particular, to paragraphs 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 16 and 17. A consensus had been achieved on the text and he recommended it for adoption without a vote.

92. Draft resolution A/C.5/49/L.9 was adopted.

AGENDA ITEM 126: FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS OBSERVER MISSION IN GEORGIA (continued) (A/C.5/49/L.13)

93. Ms. ROTHEISER (Austria) introduced the draft resolution submitted by the Chairman following informal consultations. She drew attention to paragraph 7, which provided for the apportionment of an additional amount of $7,510,900 gross ($7,295,000 net) for the period from 1 July 1994 to 13 January 1995, and to paragraphs 9 and 10. It was her understanding that the General Assembly was requesting the Secretary-General under another agenda item to establish a 12-month budget cycle for peace-keeping operations, beginning on 1 July 1995. That would not pose a problem for the United Nations Observer Mission in Georgia. Consensus had been achieved on the text, which she recommended for adoption without a vote.

94. Draft resolution A/C.5/49/L.13 was adopted.

AGENDA ITEM 111: PATTERN OF CONFERENCES (continued) (A/C.5/49/L.15)

95. Ms. PEÑA (Mexico) introduced the draft resolution submitted by the Chairman following informal consultations and indicated that corrections to the Spanish text had been circulated to delegations.

96. Draft resolution A/C.5/49/L.15 was adopted.

97. Mrs. GOICOCHEA (Cuba) expressed concern about efforts of some delegations to change existing procedure for the control and limitation of documentation, and, in particular, about efforts to reverse decisions already taken by relevant bodies concerning the provision of summary records. Her delegation looked forward to the report which the Secretary-General was to submit to the General Assembly at its fiftieth session concerning summary record requirements in certain subsidiary bodies for consideration by all Main Committees. It also wished to reaffirm the sovereign right of all Member States to request reports and to request their circulation as official documents, which was embodied in numerous General Assembly resolutions, in particular resolution 47/202.

98. Noting that certain regional groups had been unable to meet for lack of interpretation services, she expressed regret at the failure to restore 19 posts to the Office of Conference and Support Services. It was also regrettable that the report justifying the abolition of those 19 posts, requested in General Assembly resolution 48/228, paragraph 41, had never been submitted, demonstrating once again the Secretariat's failure to implement the resolutions and decisions of Member States. Referring to the draft resolution just adopted, she expressed her delegation's hope that paragraph 3 (c) would be duly implemented.

The meeting rose at 6.40 p.m.